Claims 11, 15, 17-19, 21-25, 36-39 and 41-42 have been canceled without prejudice while claims 1, 8, 16 and 35 have been amended. Thus, claims 1, 4-10, 12-14, 16 and 35 remain pending. Applicant respectfully traverses the Office's rejections and, in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, respectfully requests that the Office issue a Notice of Allowance.

§ 103 REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 4-7, 9, 16-21, 35-39 and 41-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0148327 to Satomi et al. (hereinafter, "Satomi") in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0088412 to John et al. (hereinafter, "John") in further view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0147645 to Alao et al. (hereinafter, "Alao").

Claims 8, 10-15 and 22-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Satomi in view of Alao.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance, Applicant herein amends the claims as shown above and discussed below.

Claim 1 recites a method comprising (added language underlined and emphasis added):

- receiving a first request by a load balancer at a content provider from a client over a network, wherein:

    o the first request includes a log session identifier (ID) and a first log ordering ID; and

    o the content provider includes a plurality of content servers;

- processing the first request on a first content server of the plurality of content servers to find a first result;

- incrementing the first log ordering ID *to generate a second log ordering ID designated for use by the client in a second request to the content provider*;

- storing a log entry in a log on the first content server that includes:

  o the log session ID; and

  o the first log ordering ID or the second log ordering ID;

- generating a first response at the content provider for communicating to the client over the network, wherein the first *response includes*:

  o *the second log ordering ID **designated for use by the client in a second request** to the content provider*; and

  o the first result of the processed <u>first</u> request;

- *receiving a second request by the load balancer at the content provider* from the client, wherein the second request *includes* the log session ID and *the **second log ordering ID** <u>provided to the client in the first response</u>*;

- processing the second request on a second content server of the plurality of content servers to find a second result;

- incrementing the second log ordering ID *to generate a third log ordering ID <u>designated for use by the client in a third request to the content provider</u>*;

- storing a log entry in a log on the second content server that includes:

  o the log session ID; and

  o the second log ordering ID or the third log ordering ID; and

- generating a second response for communicating over the network to the client, wherein the second response includes:

- o the third log ordering ID designated for use by the client in a third request to the content provider; and

- o the second result of the processed second request.

In setting forth a rejection of this claim before its amendment, the Office alleges that Satomi in view of John in further view of Alao renders this claim obvious. According to the Office, Satomi in view of John discloses each element of this claim other than the following:

> [G]enerating a first response at the content provider for communicating to the client over the network, wherein the *first response includes the second log ordering ID **designated for use by the client in a second request** to the content provider*; and the first result of the processed request. (Emphasis added.)

Applicant agrees that Satomi in view of John fails to disclose or suggest this element. However, the Office continues, and states the following:

> And Alao et al disclose generating a first response at the content provider for communicating to the client over the network, wherein the first response includes: the second log ordering ID designated for use by the client in a second request to the content provider; and the first result of the processed request (purchase transaction begins when a client sends a message to the server comprising session identifier associated with a cookie, the application server processes the order and returns the confirmation to the set-top box. The SPS intercepts the response, updates the order log to reflect the confirmation and forwards it to the set-top box, 0108).
>
> It would have been obvious for any person of ordinary skill in the art at that time the invention was made to combine the invention of Satomi in view of John with the invention of Alao for the benefit of allowing the system to update the order log.
>
> Office Action dated 04/01/2009, p. 4-5.

Applicant respectfully disagrees, and submits that Alao at least fails to disclose or suggest *"generating a... second log ordering ID **designated for use by the client in a second request** to the content provider"*, as recited in Applicant's claim. (Emphasis added.) In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited combination also fails to teach or suggest *"generating a... third log ordering ID **designated for use by the client in a third request** to the content provider"* as recited in Applicant's claim. (emphasis added). Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant has amended this claim to further clarify these claim elements, as discussed below.

Generally, Alao describes a method for managing the presentation and regulation of E-Commerce in an interactive television environment. According to Alao:

> A purchase transaction uses client information comprising partial client information from the client and a list of purchased items. Upon receiving partial information from the client, the server retrieves corresponding additional related information within its database and transmits this retrieved data from the server, along with the list of purchased items to complete the transaction. Business Agents are provided for logging the transaction, creating an electronic receipt, logging patches, logging error events, and viewer logging.

> Alao, abstract.

In the Action, the Office cites to Paragraph 0108 of Alao, reproduced below:

> A purchase transaction begins when *a client sends a message to the server comprising session identifier associated with a cookie and keywords* for the purchase. The SPS *associates session identifiers and cookies in a cookie to session ID table*. The order message is sent by the set-top box application to the content provider, the SPS intercepts the message, patches viewer details to the messages by replacing placeholders within the order parameters (i.e. providing credit card number), logs the order details and forwards the message to the content provider application server. *The application server processes the order and returns the confirmation to the set-top box. The SPS intercepts the response, updates the order log to reflect the confirmation and forwards it to the set-top box.* (emphasis added).

As this passage demonstrates, the method of Alao simply describes "a client send[ing] a message to the server comprising [a] session identifier associated with a cookie and keywords... [and an] application server processing the order and return[ing] the confirmation to the set-top box." However, and also as the Office points out, during the transaction an "SPS associates session identifiers and cookies in a cookie to [a] session ID table[,]... logs the order details... [and] updates the order log to reflect the confirmation." Alao, Page 11, Paragraph [0108]

Therefore, Alao makes clear that the transaction session is simply tracked and recorded. However, Applicant respectfully submits that merely tracking a session by way of a cookie, logging the session and updating a log to reflect a confirmation of an order is not *"generating a... second log ordering ID designated for use by the client in a second request to the content provider",* as recited in Applicant's claim. (emphasis added).

Stated otherwise, Alao does not generate any sort of information to pass back to the set-top box for use by the set-top box in a subsequent request. Instead, Alao simply sends a confirmation and updates the transaction log.

Additionally, because Alao does not "generat[e] a second log ordering ID designated for use by the client in a second request," Alao similarly fails to "generat[e] a third log ordering ID designated for use by the client in a third request," as also recited in Applicant's claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that this claim stands allowable.

Claims 4-7 depend from claim 1 and, as such, the remarks made above in regards to claim 1 apply equally to these claims. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features, which the references of record have not been shown to disclose, teach, or suggest.

Claim 8 recites a content provider comprising a plurality of content servers, wherein a first content server of the plurality of content servers includes a processor and memory configured to maintain (added language underlined):

- an application that is executable on the processor to:

    o process a first request from a client, the first request including a log session identifier (ID) and a first log ordering ID; and

    o increment the first log ordering ID to a second log ordering ID <u>designated for use by the client in a second request to the content provider</u>; and

- a log for storing a log entry associated with the first request, wherein the log entry has:

    o the log session identifier (ID) that references a log session that includes the request;

- o data that describes an action performed in the processing of the first request, <u>wherein the data is selected from the group consisting of:</u>

- o <u>data that had been included in the first request;</u>

- o <u>a time at which the first request was received by the application;</u>

- o <u>a description of the application;</u>

- o <u>an amount of time taken to process the first request; and</u>

- o <u>data that was included in a response to the first request;</u> and

- o the first log ordering ID or the second log ordering ID representing the sequence in which each said log entry was stored in the log by the content server<u> and unique for each said action that was performed in the processing of the first request</u>, wherein the second log ordering ID is designated for use by the client in a second request to the content provider; and

- wherein the first content server is further configured to generate a response for communication to the client in response to receiving the first request, the response including a result of the processing of the first request and the second log ordering ID designated for use by the client in a second request to the content provider.

In setting forth a rejection of claim 8 before its amendment, the Office alleges that Satomi in view of Alao renders this claim obvious. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant has amended this claim as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that Satomi in view of Alao does not disclose, teach or suggest currently-amended claim 8 for at least reasons similar to those stated above with regard to independent claim 1.

In addition, this claim also stands allowable for the newly-added claim language, which the references of record have not been shown to disclose, teach or suggest.

Claims 9-10 and 12-14 depend from claim 8 and, as such, the remarks made above in regards to claim 8 apply equally to these claims. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features, which the references of record have not been shown to disclose, teach, or suggest. Additionally, Applicant notes that while the Office has cited the John reference in rejecting dependent claim 10, John have not been shown to remedy the deficiencies in the rejection of the base claim.

Claim 16 recites a content provider comprising (added language underlined):

- a log server to initiate a log session with a client and generate a log session ID that references the log session;

- a load balancer that provides load balancing of one or more requests received during the log session from the client over a network; and

- a first content server that is communicatively coupled to the load balancer, wherein the first content server includes a processor and memory configured to maintain one or more applications that are executable on the processor to:

  - process a first request from the client received from the load balancer by performing one or more actions to find a first result;

  - increment a first log ordering identifier (ID) to generate a second log ordering ID designated for use by the client in a second request to the content provider; and

  - store a log entry on the first content server, the first log entry having:

    - the log session ID that references the log session;

- data that describes one said action, wherein the data is selected from the group consisting of:

  - data that had been included in the first request;

  - a time at which the first request was received by the application;

  - a description of the application;

  - an amount of time taken to process the first request; and

  - data that was included in a response to the first request; and

  - the first log ordering ID or the second log ordering ID that is unique for the one said action;

- generate a first response for communication to the client over the network, wherein the first response includes:

  - the second log ordering ID designated for use by the client in a second request to the content provider; and

  - the first result of the processed first request; and

- a second content server that is communicatively coupled to the load balancer, wherein the second content server includes a processor and memory configured to maintain one or more applications that are executable on the processor to:

  - process a second request from the client received from the load balancer by performing one or more actions to find a second result, wherein the second request includes the log session ID and the second log ordering ID provided to the client in the first response;

  - increment the second log ordering ID to generate a third log ordering ID designated for use by the client in a third request;

- o store a log entry in a log on the second content server that includes:

  - <u>a client ID that identifies the client that provided the second request;</u>

  - the log session ID; and

  - the second log ordering ID or the third log ordering ID; and

  - generate a second response for communication over the network to the client, wherein the second response includes:

    - the third log ordering ID designated for use by the client in a third request to the content provider; and

    - the second result of the processed second request.

In setting forth a rejection of claim 16 before its amendment, the Office alleges that Satomi in view of John in further view of Alao renders this claim obvious. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant has amended this claim as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that Satomi in view of John in further view of Alao does not disclose, teach or suggest currently-amended claim 16 for at least reasons similar to those stated above with regard to independent claim 1. In addition, this claim also stands allowable for the newly-added claim language, which the references of record have not been shown to disclose, teach or suggest.

Claim 35 recites a system comprising (added language underlined):

- a <u>set-top box</u> communicatively coupled to <u>a</u> network, and including a processor and memory that is configured to maintain an interface application that is stored in the memory and is executable on the processor to communicate one or more requests <u>comprising an order for a good or service that is available for purchase or an order for content that is available for broadcast by a content provider</u> over a network; and

- <u>the</u> content provider that is communicatively coupled to the <u>set-top box</u> over the network, and including:

  - <u>a log server to initiate a log session with the set-top box and to generate a log session ID that references the log session;</u>

  - a load balancer that provides load balancing of the one or more requests received during the log session from the <u>set-top box</u> over the network; and

  - a plurality of content servers that are communicatively coupled to the load balancer, wherein a first content server of the plurality of content servers includes a processor and memory that is configured to maintain one or more applications that are executable on the processor to:

    - process a first request to find a first result;

    - increment a first log ordering identifier (ID) received from the <u>set-top box</u> with the first request to generate a second log ordering ID <u>designated for use by the set-top box in a second request to the content provider;</u>

    - store a log entry on a log <u>in the memory of</u> the first content server <u>that processed the first request</u>, wherein the log entry has:

      - <u>a set-top box ID that identifies the set-top box that communicated the first request;</u>

- <u>the</u> log session identifier (ID) that references the log session;

- data that describes <u>an action performed in</u> the processing of the first request; and

- the first log ordering ID or the second log ordering ID <u>designated for use by the set-top box in a second request to the content provider</u>, wherein the log ordering IDs represent the sequence in which log entries are stored by the plurality of content servers; and

- generate a response for communication to the <u>set-top box</u> over the network, wherein the response includes the first result of the processing of the first request and the second log ordering ID designated for use by the <u>set-top box</u> in a second request to the content provider.

In setting forth a rejection of claim 35 before its amendment, the Office alleges that Satomi in view of John in further view of Alao renders this claim obvious. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant has amended this claim as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that Satomi in view of John in further view of Alao does not disclose, teach or suggest currently-amended claim 35 for at least reasons similar to those stated above with regard to independent claim 1. In addition, this claim also stands allowable for the newly-added claim language, which the references of record have not been shown to disclose, teach or suggest.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and an early notice of allowance. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
601 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 1400
Spokane, WA 99201

Dated:2009/08/03

/Robert G. Hartman 58,970/
Robert G. Hartman
Reg. No. 58,970
(509) 944-4765